



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/743,172	12/22/2003	Kenichi Kawase	112857-453	7752
29175	7590	12/26/2008	EXAMINER	
BELL, BOYD & LLOYD, LLP			LEE, CYNTHIA K	
P. O. BOX 1135			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
CHICAGO, IL 60690			1795	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			12/26/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Response to Amendment

This Office Action is responsive to the amendment filed on 5/12/2008. Claims 1-4,6-12,14-19 are pending. Claims 1 and 9 are withdrawn from further consideration as being drawn to a non-elected invention. Applicant's arguments have been fully considered and are not persuasive. Claims 2-4,6-8,10-12,14-19 are finally rejected for reasons of record.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 2-4,6-8,10-12,14-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Fujimoto et al. (US 2004/0224231 A1), as evidenced by Asahina (US 2007/0275301).

With respect to claims 2-4,8,10-12,14,16, Fujimoto et al. teach a lithium secondary battery, wherein an anode comprising a current collector having projections and a silicon thin film is deposited on the current collector by using an RF sputtering technique. The current collector component diffuses into the thin film to form a solid solution. See paragraphs 50,59, claim 13, Figure 4.

Art Unit: 1795

With respect to claims 6,7,15, Fujimoto et al. teach an electrolytic deposition of copper particles on the copper current collector. See paragraph 50.

With respect to claims 2 and 10, Fujimoto et al. teach the surface roughness of the copper foil is 5.99 um. See Table 1. The surface roughness R_y is the maximum height. See Asahina (US 2007/0275301) [0012].

With respect to claims 17,18, Fujimoto et al. teach the lithium rechargeable battery comprising the use of carbonates as solvent the use of lithium salts as the electrolyte salt. See paragraph 38.

With respect to claim 19, Fujimoto et al. teach the use of LiCoO_2 as the cathode active material. See paragraph 39.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 2-4,6-8,10-12,14-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Akagi et al. (JP 11-135115) in view of Fujimoto et al. (US 2004/0224231 A1), as evidenced by Asahina (US 2007/0275301).

With respect to claims 2-4,8,10-12,14,16, Akagi et al. teach a lithium secondary battery, wherein an anode comprising a current collector and a silicon thin film is deposited on the current collector by using an RF sputtering technique. The resulting

Art Unit: 1795

anode is heat treated under vacuum. See paragraph 5-8. However, Akagi et al. do not teach the use of a current collector having projections. Fujimoto et al. teach a lithium secondary battery, wherein the projections on the copper collector would help accommodate a change in volume of the active material when it expands and shrinks during charge and discharge. See paragraphs 50,83. With respect to claims 2 and 10, Fujimoto et al. teach the surface roughness of the copper foil is 5.99 μm . See Table 1. The surface roughness R_y is the maximum height. See Asahina (US 2007/0275301) [0012]. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to form projections in the current collector of Akagi using the method of Fujimoto, because Fujimoto et al. teach the projections on the copper collector help accommodate the change in volume of the active material during charge and discharge cycles.

Moreover, Akagi and Fujimoto do not specifically disclose the silicon thin film alloys with the copper current collector. However, it is the position of the examiner that such properties are inherent, given that both Akagi et al. and the present application utilize the same processing procedures and thermal treatment. A reference which is silent about a claimed invention's features is inherently anticipatory if the missing feature *is necessarily present in that which is described in the reference*. In re Robertson, 49 USPQ2d 1949 (1999).

With respect to claims 6,7,15, Fujimoto et al. teach an electrolytic deposition of copper particles on the copper current collector. See paragraph 50.

Art Unit: 1795

With respect to claims 17,18, Akagi et al. teach the lithium rechargeable battery comprising the use of carbonates as solvent the use of lithium salts as the electrolyte salt. See paragraph 10.

With respect to claim 19, Akagi et al. teach the use of LiCoO_2 as the cathode active material. See paragraph 9.

6. Claims 2-4,6-8,10-12,14-16,18,19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Neudecker et al. (US 6,242,132 B1) in view of Fujimoto et al. (US 2004/0224231 A1), as evidenced by Asahina (US 2007/0275301).

With respect to claims 2-4,8,10-12,14,16,18, Neudecker et al. teach a lithium secondary battery, wherein an anode comprising a current collector and a silicon-tin oxynitride film is deposited on a heated current collector by using an electron beam evaporation technique. See Column 7, Lines 1-43. However, Neudecker et al. do not teach the use of a current collector having projections. Fujimoto et al. teach a lithium secondary battery, wherein the projections on the copper collector would help accommodate a change in volume of the active material when it expands and shrinks during charge and discharge. See paragraphs 50,83. With respect to claims 2 and 10, Fujimoto et al. teach the surface roughness of the copper foil is 5.99 μm . See Table 1. The surface roughness R_y is the maximum height. See Asahina (US 2007/0275301) [0012]. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to form projections in the current collector of Neudecker using the method of Fujimoto, because

Art Unit: 1795

Fujimoto et al. teach the projections on the copper collector help accommodate the change in volume of the active material during charge and discharge cycles.

Moreover, Neudecker and Fujimoto do not specifically disclose the silicon thin film alloys with the copper current collector. However, it is the position of the examiner that such properties are inherent, given that both Akagi et al. and the present application utilize the same processing procedures. A reference which is silent about a claimed invention's features is inherently anticipatory if the missing feature *is necessarily present in that which is described in the reference*. In re Robertson, 49 USPQ2d 1949 (1999).

With respect to claims 6,7,15, Fujimoto et al. teach an electrolytic deposition of copper particles on the copper current collector. See paragraph 50.

With respect to claim 19, Neudecker et al. teach the use of LiCoO_2 as the cathode active material. See Figure 4.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 10/24/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that the term projection is described as a particle shape on the surface of the substrate.

In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., the definition of projection) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are

Art Unit: 1795

not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Applicant argues that the particle projection has a height of 1.89 um because the particle may form part of the total maximum height, but not the entire height.

The Examiner remains unpersuaded. It is noted that the claims do not recite that the projections are solely made of particles. It is noted that the entire projection on the substrate of Fujimoto is 5.99 um.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to CYNTHIA LEE whose telephone number is (571)272-8699. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8:30am-5pm.

Art Unit: 1795

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Patrick Ryan can be reached on 571-272-1292. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Cynthia Lee/
Examiner, Art Unit 1795

/PATRICK RYAN/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art
Unit 1795